(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI SUBHASH MAHARIA)- (a) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) was implemented in about 2.5 lakhs Panchayat! Raj Institutions at the Districts, Block and Village levels. Some complaints are received in the Ministry from the different parts *of* the *country.* The complaint, if any, received regarding mis-utilisation or mis-appropriation of the funds were/are forwarded to the respective State Government for necessary action which are the appropriate authorities for taking action against the erring implementing officials/ non-officials.

(b) In order to ensure proper implementation of the programme including prevention of leakage, the following steps have been taken by the Central Government:

(i) Selection of works and beneficiary by the Gram Sabha.

(ii) Social audit by the Gram Sabha,

(iii) Constitution of Vigilance and Monitoring Committee at the Block, District and State level.

(iv) Utilization Certificate and Audit Report is essential for release of second instalment of Central share of funds.

(v) Non-embezzlement/Non-diversion Certificate from the district authority before release of second instalment of Central share of funds.

(vi) Field visits by the officials of the Ministry under Area Officers Scheme.

(vii) Physical verification of the assets created on the spot by the District and State officials.

(c) to (e) No such report has been received in the Ministry of Rural Development.

Declining trend of Investment for Rural Development

440. SHRI KARNENDU BHATTACHARJEE: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Indian Rural Development Report, 1999 has pointed out that the trend of investment in rural development has been declining over the years;

(b) if so, the total allocation made for rural development during the last five years, year-wise and State-wise; and

(c) what steps are proposed to be taken to reverse the trend and correct the imbalance by providing higher allocation for rural development?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI SUNDAR LAL PATWA): (a) The India Rural Development Report, 1999 has brought out that the Rural Development budgetary allocation for the Ministry of Rural Development has been showing a rising trend in the last few years. However, the report has also pointed out that there has been a declining trend in the per capita expenditure in Rural Development in the State budgets over the years in the VIII Plan period.

(b) A statement showing the total allocation made, both by the Central Govt, and the State Govt, together, for rural development during the last five years, State-wise and year-wise, is annexed. *(See* below)

(c) The Government of India allocation for rural development is steadily increasing over the years. In the current budget, a new scheme called 'Pradhan Mantri Gramodaya Yojana' has been launched and special funds have been allocated to improve rural connectivity. Most of the Rural Development programmes have been restructured to increase the investment levels in rural areas. One more new scheme 'Annapuma' has also been introduced by the Govt, this year.

Statement

(Rs. in Lakhs)

SI. No.	Name of the States/UTs.	Allocations during the years				
		1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	68074.03	68682.00	96300.69	89718.38	77778.78
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3390.54	4400.83	7723.18	10669.82	8658.59
3.	Assam	23275.27	24050.72	36449.30	575527.98	52894.01
4.	Bihar	122319.68	115907.99	140934,76	178263.28	188841.86
5.	Goa	1198.52	1228.35	2039.15	2607.12	1780.56
6	Gujarat	32483.92	32750.34	41436.53	44236.56	47309.62
7.	Haryana	9422.90	9781.32	13943.07	17143.05	16544.68
8	Himachal Pradesh	9282.83	10043,77	13019.92	15400.39	12742.36
9.	Jammu and Kashmir	14380.26	14202,76	21543.00	23900.90	30062.54
1	Karnataka	50558.89	52367.53	68770.28	66008.40	55321.86

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Kerala	20049.19	21533.46	27685.41	30596.05	28860.22
1	Madhya Pradesh	36602.24	82285.28	111858.35	123533.71	94904.47
1	Maharashtra	90382.22	99582.69	114775.88	123578.44	1155823.5
1	Manipur	2305.07	3108.26	4360.36	6185.89	4975.98
1	Meghalaya	2691.12	3556.39	3495.19	6441.37	6222.71
1	Mizoram	1100.58	1514.26	2559.36	3512.90	2172.00
1	Nagaland	1860.28	1991.53	4594.58	6577.21	4302.90
1	Orissa	49966.94	49021.92	68803.50-	75042.13	68413.35
1	Punjab	6704.00	7567.15	9576.81	14360.67	10880.46
2	Rajasthan	53536.24	54214.72	69084.16	67513.66	60344.59
2	Sikkim	1599.42	1482.31	1851.30	2648.66	2198.17
2	Tamil Nadu	58735.70	57890.51	86768.35	96293.49	69428.86
2	Tripura	2967.14	5496.31	5118.91	9228.60	7536.74
2	Uttar Pradesh	150248.29	154979.36	207331.93	239150.40	220767.03
2	West Bengal	55244.00	54178.78	68822.87	77192.01	91323.00
2	A and N Islands	1259.93	1251.08	1310.21	2078.79	1913.31
2	Chandigarh	57.07	63.43	16.59	16.59	24.17
2	D & N Haveli	241.51	270.52	448.47	654.82	694.37
2	Daman and Diu	175.49	208.82	178.75	30381	352.95
3	Delhi	747.11	877.74	1031.27	1081.27	732.01
3	Lakshadweep	163.74	163.95	196.51	348.'56	271.22
3	Pondicherry	345.45	350.98	457.75	409.70	10794.85

Amount sanctioned to Bihar under various poverty alleviation schemes

441. SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the amount provided to Bihar under different poverty alleviation programmes during the last three financial years;

(b) what has been the extent of utilisation of these funds, with reference to a particular scheme;

(c) whether any amount under a particular scheme in a particular year remained unutilised if so. the amount which remained unutilised; and

(d) whether Government have got any report over the actual implementation of these programmes and the number of people living below poverty line who have been benefitted from the said scheme?

THE MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI SUNDAR LAL PATWA): (a) to (d) The funds allocated by the Ministry of Rural Development to the State of Bihar, total funds available with the State, their utilisation, the unspent balances and physical achievements under different poverty alleviation programmes during the years 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 are given in the statement annexed. *(See* below)